HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 10 | Monday, March 10, 1958 | Washington, D. C.

News Section | *Printed in Two Sections*

MacARTHUR: *Nixon pays a call*.....(page 1)
DISABILITY: *Bridges urges action*.....(page 1)
REUTHER: *Rackets committee fireworks*.....(page 2)
CIVIL RIGHTS: *Modern GOP handiwork*.....(page 4)
FARMERS: *Free agriculture pays off*.....(page 4)

NEW ADDRESS FOR HUMAN EVENTS:
408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C.
To take care of our rapid growth, we are moving into space more than twice as large as that which we have been occupying.

Summit in the Waldorf: Scarcely noticed in the press, an interesting meeting recently took place in the Waldorf Towers Apartment Hotel, between General of the Army Douglas MacArthur and Vice President Richard Nixon. Reports of that potentially significant *tête-à-tête* have engaged the attention of important political circles in Washington and provided much food for thought and speculation.

The meeting — it is important to mention — came at the instance of Nixon, who chose the occasion of the General's birthday to pay a call. In Washington, it is believed that it was Nixon's own idea and that he did not clear his visit with the White House. It is recalled that President Eisenhower invited his former commander to the White House only once, in 1954, to attend a large luncheon. Although many Republicans have frequently urged that Eisenhower consult MacArthur — whom the Chief of the British Imperial Staff, Viscount Alanbrooke, referred to last year as "the greatest general" to emerge from World War II — to get his views on the handling of the world military situation, no such move was made unofficially or officially by the White House.

Not only Republicans but also Democrats have long believed that the views of the General in the Waldorf should be sought on our present critical situation. To this end, Senator Theodore Green (D.-R.I.) tried to get MacArthur to testify before a congressional committee; but the General declined, reportedly saying that he had not been given access to vital intelligence reports and briefings.

The subject matter of the Waldorf colloquy, however, was not world military strategy, but the economic state of the Nation — according to the version abroad in the Capital. MacArthur, it seems, did most of the talking — in his characteristically vivid fashion — and Nixon paid alert attention. The General discoursed for an hour on the dangers of inflation and the crushing burden of taxation which the Nation has had to bear. He warned Nixon that overtaxation undermined the Roman Empire and led to the debacle which ushered in the Dark Ages.

MacArthur is now a business executive — Chairman of Sperry Rand Corporation. But he pointed out to the Vice President that it is the little man in the street who has to pay most of the tax bill. Only about 15 per cent of the Government's revenue, MacArthur said, comes from the higher brackets. He emphasized that this is not in fact redistributing wealth, but simply prevents accumulation of savings and the capital formation necessary to finance economic expansion. The General gave it as his opinion that taxes should be reduced by at least 25 per cent.

MacArthur wound up with the opinion that foreign aid is of very little importance and that the Administration should not rely to any extent on this factor in shaping its domestic and foreign policies.

What did the Vice President say? From the Washington end, no information is forthcoming. But friends of MacArthur in New York say that Nixon indicated agreement with the General's statement of the issues. If this be true, then the Vice President may prove a convert to the MacArthur viewpoint, may be edging away from the support he seems to have been giving wholeheartedly to the globalist philosophy of the White House crowd. And, in case he should succeed to the Presidency in the near future, the chances of tax relief would appear bright.

Presidential Succession: That front-page story — the President's arrangement with Nixon for the latter to take over power temporarily if Ike becomes disabled — is not likely to stop with the filing of a proposed constitutional amendment to legalize it. The amendment process would take perhaps three years. Some forces in Congress want a law — not an amendment — right away. The urgency of their mood can be suggested by a paraphrase of this sort:

"This so-called Ike-and-Dick arrangement is the people's business, not to be decided upon by any Palace Guard or kitchen cabinet, not to be decreed by faceless persons behind a screen of secrecy; it must be arbitrated by the people through their representatives in Congress. And — the way things look — a law (and not only a long drawn-out amendment) should be passed immediately."

These are blunt words. But this sophisticated Capital knows very well that no one voluntarily gives up power; concretely, it knows that Sherman Adams isn't going to give up his power unless forced to do so by Congress. For "Sherm" is the big factor in this legal muddle, which few in the press seem inclined to examine with care. The "Boss of the White House" — everyone here believes — tailored the Ike-Dick "arrangement" to his taste.

Adams — no one doubts — fears that he will be ousted from his job if Nixon should become permanent President; it's well known that no love is lost between the two. However, if Nixon becomes only a temporary President (to

Published weekly at 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be returned to the Vice Presidency if Adams and Ike decide the latter is well enough to resume the Presidential chair) then Adams will keep his job and "keep Dick under his thumb."

Hence the nature of the private Ike-Dick "arrangement" which Ike, perhaps inadvertently, leaked during his press conference and which the ensuing furor forced into the open. Democrats therefore demand legislation to take care of the problem immediately, and object to awaiting passage of a constitutional amendment. ("Sherm will go out with Ike in three years — in 1960 — anyway," is one observation.) Many Republicans think similarly. One of them is Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.), powerful Chairman of the Senate GOP Policy Committee.

In the past 24 hours, Bridges reiterated to HUMAN EVENTS his desire for immediate legislation on the disability problem, to provide for unfortunate contingencies until an amendment can be passed. He has already embodied it in a bill (S. 3113) which would establish a group — composed of the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tem of the Senate, and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the House and Senate — as the key committee responsible for initiating a resolution, subject to approval or rejection by Congress, to transfer the duties of the Presidency to the Vice President, in case the President is disabled. Likewise, if the President seems to have recovered, this committee would be responsible for initiating the reverse process — transferring the duties from the temporary President back to the permanent President.

This is a Republican proposal, but the Democrats may well tighten it further. For no definite end is yet in sight for the developing argument over what happens to the Presidency "in case of disability," as the Constitution puts it.

Reuther on Trial: The hirelings of Walter Reuther's UAW, Capital newsmen believe, may be slowly destroying themselves in the eyes of the public. The excesses of UAW Secretary-Treasurer Emil Mazey (Reuther's second in command) last week — when he spat out abusive language in the hearing room (a member of the HUMAN EVENTS staff was present when Mazey repeated his obscenities for the benefit of the UAW entourage) and charged a group of Catholic clergymen with being "not men of integrity" — have done much, it is believed, to reveal the true stature of the so-called "labor statesmen" who run the UAW.

Thus, by degrees, a massive, incriminating record is being compiled in the pyrotechnical investigation of Reuther's vendetta against the Kohler Company. And, it is noted, this is taking place in spite of the fact that the Democratic portion of the Rackets Committee has been more vigorous in protecting the sensibilities of Reuther's goons than in forcing them to give straight answers to questions about mass picketing and violence.

● Particularly noted in this connection is the tendency of the Committee to let the UAW witnesses launch into long-winded, repetitious oratory (exactly like that Reuther himself employs) when asked simple questions requiring only yes-or-no answers. Questions like, "*did you so conduct the picket line that nonstrikers could not get in to go to their jobs?*" have been greeted by soapbox speeches about "the rights of labor." Coached by attorney Joseph L. Rauh, former national chairman of the ADA, the UAW witnesses have been allowed to indulge in repeated evasions on almost all such elementary questions concerning the union's lawless reign in the village of Kohler.

● Kohler representatives, on the other hand, have been subjected to some of the same abrasive handling that the Committee meted out last year — not unjustly — to delinquent Teamsters. The most significant encounter between Chairman McClellan and the Kohler representatives in the early phase of the hearings came when the Arkansas Senator attempted to establish that the Kohler Company had retained a United Press photographer to take pictures of Committee members in conversation with UAW attorney Rauh. McClellan saw no reason why the Company should retain its own photographer, and, his voice shaking, assailed the move as "pretty low," "pretty rotten," and possible "smear." Friends of McClellan remarked: "John is getting pretty touchy."

Kohler counsel Lyman Conger drily observed that the time to make such charges would be after evidence was found that any improper use had been made of the pictures — not before. (Kohler spokesmen said the pictures were for use in the company house organ — the average circulation of which is only a few thousand.)

Senator Carl Curtis (R.-Neb.), moreover, pointed out that, when Reuther testified in 1956 before the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, he brought along his own photographers for still pictures — as well as his own movie cameramen — and had special microphones installed in front of each member of the Subcommittee. Reuther's arrogance in this instance excited no cries of "low," "rotten" or "smear" from Subcommittee Chairman Albert Gore (D.-Tenn.), or from any other Democrat, including McClellan.

● It is noted that Chairman McClellan appears to be considerably on edge during the current hearings. His conservative sympathies and his loyalties to the Democratic party, it is felt, are pulling him in opposite directions and he has become extremely sensitive to GOP charges that he and his Counsel may be "covering up" for Reuther. (As *New York Times* correspondent Joseph Loftus noted last week — in connection with the squabble over the order in which the witnesses would be heard — Democratic Leader Lyndon Johnson "might have dropped a word to Senator McClellan that Mr. Reuther, a substantial supporter of most Democratic candidates, would like to make his spiel early in the show.") Thus, analysts believe McClellan was too quick to jump to the conclusion that Kohler's photographer was hired to catch him in a pose suggesting collusion with the UAW — which accounts for the abusive language that he unjustifiably heaped on the Kohler Company.

Capital conservatives note, however, that the Chairman is by no means prepared to let union representatives run

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wild during the hearings. McClellan has been quick to gavel the UAW's obstreperous counsel Rauh into silence—most notably during the course of Thursday's shouting contest between Rauh and Senator Karl Mundt (R.-S.D.), concerning Emil Mazey's remarks of the previous day. McClellan firmly let Rauh know that, unless he behaved himself, he would be ejected from the hearing room.

● Observers believe that Senator John F. Kennedy (D.-Mass.), in another explosive incident, may have impaired his chances for advancing to the Presidency in 1960. Kennedy lashed the Kohler Company for employing detectives to find out whether UAW strike leader Robert Burkhardt was living with a woman in Wisconsin, while his wife and two children languished in Toledo, Ohio. (Burkhardt had informed the Committee that, in addition to his union activities, he had also served as a Sunday school teacher.)

Exposing Burkhardt's extramarital activities, Kennedy declared, was "the most despicable business that a company can be involved in." Senator Goldwater replied by noting that "it is rather despicable on Mr. Burkhardt's part" to leave his wife and children to live with another woman.

Foreign Aid: Two weeks after Eric Johnston's mass rally on behalf of foreign aid, newsmen can observe only one kind of reaction on Capitol Hill — negative. As hearings opened last week before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, International Cooperation Administration (ICA) Director James H. Smith, Jr. was subjected to a barrage of hostile questions. It was expected that conservative legislators would blow their tops; but considered particularly noteworthy were such "liberal" comments as those of Representative Wayne Hays (D.-Ohio), who attacked the foreign-aid program in the Middle East, declaring that we are "making the rich richer and the poor poorer and the people blame the United States." Another "liberal" Democrat, Representative Barratt O'Hara of Illinois, said ICA was "a closed corporation — a little group of people who won't listen to advice."

Meanwhile, congressional moves were afoot to curtail the freewheeling activities of promoter Johnston. Senator George Malone (R.-Nev.) and Representative Cleveland M. Bailey (D. - W. Va.) introduced measures last week aimed at requiring Johnston to register as a lobbyist. Malone declared that "Johnston is clearly lobbying under terms of the [Federal lobbying] act and must register and report his receipts and expenditures. It will be very interesting to see who is contributing to this campaign to increase the number of jobless working men in the United States in order to benefit industries and investors on foreign soil."

Teller: Patriotic Americans hailed the forthright stand taken last week by famed physicist Edward Teller, appearing on the NBC television panel show, "Meet the Press." Teller, whose efforts made possible US production of the hydrogen bomb, told reporters that "disarmament is a lost cause," and put himself firmly on record as expecting the Soviet Union to cheat on any agreement it arrives at, if it believes such cheating to its advantage. (Further testimony, say Capital analysts, to the futility of "Summit" talks with the Moscow bosses.) Teller's reasons for this declaration are cited as a welcome exception to the filmy pacifism and wishful thinking which the public is accustomed to associating with atomic scientists.

"If we agree with the Russians to stop testing," Teller stated, "we, a democratic country, will actually stop testing. Whether or not the Russians stop testing will depend on a number of points. If they are determined to continue testing and if they are intelligent enough to elude the check which we are discussing, I am virtually certain they will find methods to cheat and to continue with their testing program." He added that "there are very serious, very effective possibilities of hiding nuclear tests."

● Other Teller quotes of note: "If you eliminate nuclear explosives, then you will make the anti-missile defense an insoluble problem. . . . In the long run, I expect, [you] eliminate the possibility of war by removing the will, not by removing the means.

"If you try to remove the means, you create the same kind of unstable situation which brought about the Second World War, where all the peace-loving nations disarmed, and one cruel dictatorship ran away with the armament."

UN: Cited as evidence of the "double standard" of morality observed by the United Nations — soft on Communists, hard on anti-Communists — is the recent action taken against Povl Bang-Jensen, a United Nations official who refused to turn over to the UN Secretariat a secret list of witnesses who testified on the Hungarian revolution. Bang-Jensen said that he felt bound, both legally and morally, to keep the list in his personal possession, to insure that the witnesses would be protected from reprisals by the Communists (see HUMAN EVENTS for December 28, 1957).

Bang-Jensen was suspended from his office with the UN, December 4, and now has been formally accused, by a "kangaroo court" committee headed by American Ernest A. Gross (former Assistant Secretary of State under Dean Acheson), of "misconduct" during the controversy over the list of witnesses. According to the fortnightly magazine, *USA* — in which publisher Alice Widener has played a leading role in opening up the Bang-Jensen case for public inspection — the Danish official was accused of conduct that "departed markedly from normal and rational standards of behavior."

In the same issue of *USA* (February 28, 1958), Edith Kermit Roosevelt shows that this charge against Bang-Jensen was the culmination of a "behind-the-scenes and on-scenes campaign to discredit [him] by casting doubt on his mental and emotional stability." While the UN's left-wingers hammer Bang-Jensen's refusal to hand over the list as evidence of mental illness, conservatives second the verdict of *USA* and the *Saturday Evening Post:* that Bang-Jensen's action protected "the honor of the anti-Communist West."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Civil Rights Commission: Who will run the Civil Rights Commission, which is slated to play a big role in various controversies south of the Mason-Dixon line? The Capital thinks that, in such matters, it is less the Chairman (usually some big public figure) than it is the Director of Staff (the man who really does the work). Thus, the spotlight is shifted to one Gordon Tiffany of Concord, N.H., whose White House appointment as the Commission's Director of Staff is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee for approval or rejection.

Dixiecrats will be interested to learn that Tiffany does not belong to the right wing of the Republican party in Republican New Hampshire — the wing (exemplified by William Loeb, publisher of the *Manchester Union-Leader)* which believes that "civil rights" are a matter of internal moral convictions, and not a matter of sumptuary laws. Tiffany is a Modern Republican. How representative he is of the people there is seen in the fact that last year he ran for Mayor of Concord and was defeated by his Democratic opponent. (As in Wisconsin and other states, defeat of New England Modern Republicans seems to be the order of the day.)

Next, Southerners might consider the fact that Tiffany is a protégé of White House boss Sherman Adams, also a Modern Republican. He was made Attorney General of New Hampshire by Adams, when the latter was Governor of that state. Also, Adams exerted influence to get Tiffany appointed Director of Staff and asked the help of members of the New Hampshire delegation to Congress. Tiffany himself told the press that Sherman Adams had asked him to take the job.

Yet members of Congress note that an effort has been made to cover up this high intercession. For White House Press Secretary Hagerty ("that man again") told the press that Sherman Adams had nothing to do with the appointment.

Farm Ferment: A recent series of articles appearing in *The Houston Chronicle,* comparing Texas cotton production with that of neighboring Mexico, point up the merits of a system of free agriculture. "On the Texas side farmers are chafing at Government restrictions," reports the *Chronicle.* "On the Mexican side, where there are no controls, an avalanche of agricultural wealth is pouring in."

Mexicans farming along the Rio Grande, and selling to a world market, have increased their cotton production tenfold since 1938. On the Texas side of the river, however, cotton production is at less than half of capacity — owing to crop controls and acreage placed in the soil bank.

Additional light is shed on the farm problem by economist Raymond F. Mikesell, in his well-documented study, *Agricultural Surpluses and Export Policy* (published by the American Enterprise Association, 1012 14th Street, NW, Washington 5, D C; $1). Mikesell shows how — and why — Government farm-surplus disposal programs have failed to solve the farm problem while alienating friends abroad who resent the "dumping" of American surpluses in their markets. Farm surpluses are caused by Governmental policies — says Mikesell — but we can restore farm production to a status in which it can win its share of world exports on a nonsubsidized basis: "American agriculture undoubtedly has a significant competitive advantage . . . and does not need protection or subsidies to survive."

Book Event: *Child of the Revolution,* by Wolfgang Leonhard; introduction by Edward Crankshaw; Henry Regnery Co.; $6.50.

As a boy of 13, Wolfgang Leonhard was taken by his mother, a German Communist, to the Soviet Union. A few months later, at the end of 1936, she disappeared in the great purge and was not seen again by her son for 13 years. He grew up in a Soviet Children's Home for Austrian and German émigrés in Moscow, whence he was sent to the Comintern advanced schools for selected young foreigners to be trained for important political tasks abroad.

In April, 1945, Leonhard was sent to Germany in a Soviet aircraft, as one of the first ten Communist party officials under the leadership of Walter Ulbricht, and discharged his first political mission by helping to establish the Communist administration of Berlin. In March, 1949, Leonhard was shocked and disillusioned by the Soviet denunciation of Yugoslavia, which seemed to flout all that he had been taught and believed about communism. He fled to Belgrade, where the present story ends.

In November, 1950, the author moved to Western Germany, and is now working at St. Antony's College, Oxford, on a new book devoted to the evolution of the Soviet Union since Stalin's death.

Leonhard's gripping personal story, viewing much of communism's development from the inside, is also an important historical document.

All books reviewed or condensed in HUMAN EVENTS may be obtained, at the bookstore price, from The Bookmailer, Box 101, Murray Hill Station, New York 16, N. Y.

HENRY PRATHER FLETCHER, Former Republican National Chairman: "HUMAN EVENTS gives the most informative, realistic and courageous report on the Washington scene and is a healthy, full-blooded American voice in Babbledom."

Additional copies of 4-page News Section or Article Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20, 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots of $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: $14 a year; airmail, Europe, Latin America, $21 a year, airmail, Asia, Africa and Pacific, $36 a year.
Bound Annual Volume for 1957, with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 10, 1958

Article Section I *Printed in Two Sections*

FOREIGN AID IS NOT CHRISTIAN

US Giveaways Are Based on Marxist Assumptions

By ELGIN GROSECLOSE

ERIC JOHNSTON'S much-publicized rally, February 25, disclosed the great variety of groups and interests that can be induced to exert pressure on behalf of America's multi-billion-dollar program of foreign aid. Present at the rally, although receiving less publicity than the numerous celebrities from the world of politics, were important representatives of the Protestant, Catholic and Jewish faiths.

The participation of these men in such a gathering reflects the obsession with foreign aid which has afflicted many leaders of organized religion in America. It is certain, for example, that the Administration's foreign aid program would not have been meekly accepted by the Congress last year, but for the rousing endorsement it had been given by a list of prominent churchmen and representatives of philanthropic societies.

During the hearings held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, three days were given over to these proponents of foreign aid. Their concerted appearance in Washington suggested an organized demonstration. There is no evidence that they came to Washington spontaneously or upon the demand of any substantial constituency of Christian believers. There had been no general consultation with the laity on the subject of foreign aid. There is considerable evidence, furthermore, that these churchmen have ignored or discounted the views of competent missionaries who have reported their concern about the adverse effects of the foreign-aid program.

What is more to the point is that these churchmen, in their charitable concern for other peoples, are unwittingly betraying the Body of Christ into the hands of the Marxists — the very enemies of the Faith they cherish.

This is a hard, unpleasant truth, and it requires some explanation. The Christian and Jewish view, which stands in opposition to Marxian theory (and the theory upon which the foreign-aid program is based), is that the reform of societies begins from within, rather than from without — with the reform of the individual through a change of heart and outlook.

As a man "thinketh in his heart, so is he" (Proverbs xxiii, 7) is the Old Testament doctrine. The teaching of Jesus is more explicit: "Do not ye yet understand, that whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught? But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies: These are the things which defile a man: but to eat with unwashen hands defileth not a man" (Matthew xv, 17-20).

THE MARXIST VIEW is the contrary. The Marxian doctrine, adopted by the proponents of foreign aid, is that societies are changed from without, and that the individual is changed in accordance with the changes in the external environment. This is called "environmental conditioning."

Here is the classic Marxist statement, in which Karl Marx, writing in the Preface to his *Das Kapital,* explains his basic philosophy: "With me . . . the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."

Frederick Engels, Marx's disciple and co-worker, spells out the materialistic doctrine in more detail. "The ultimate causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought," he writes in *Anti-Dühring*, "not in the heads of men, not in their better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in the changes in the methods of production and exchange; they are to be sought not in the *philosophy*, but in the *economics* of the particular epoch."

What do the official proponents of the foreign aid program say? In the first place, they make clear that foreign aid is not a national benevolence on behalf of other peoples of the world. This is the first error of the churchmen in their endorsement of foreign aid. Foreign aid, to use the words of Secretary Dulles, is "an instrument of foreign policy." As the President took pains to make clear in his radio address to the Nation, on May 22 of last year: "This program — I repeat — serves our own national interest."

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Second, the foreign aid program is a mass effort to condition whole societies, the policies of governments, and the affections and loyalties of peoples, by the administration of "environmental conditioning." In this experiment the American people have authorized, to date, the investment, in grants, loans, and other forms of material assistance, of nearly $75 billion. Faith in the power of money and material techniques to change societies and peoples is the fabric of the program. This faith may be read in every official statement, beginning with the famous Point Four of President Truman's inaugural address that initiated the program:

"Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge."

Here is a more academic statement of the theory of foreign aid, written by the group of scholars engaged by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to advise on the foreign aid program:

> The proposition is that a comprehensive and sustained program of American economic assistance aimed at helping the free underdeveloped countries *to create conditions for self-sustaining economic* growth can, in the short run, materially reduce the danger of conflict triggered by aggressive minor powers, and can, in say 2 or 3 decades, result in an overwhelming preponderance of societies with a successful record of solving their problems without recourse to coercion or violence. . . . An effectively designed program of aid for economic development is the best instrument available to the United States for encouraging the growth of politically mature, democratic societies.*

The statement could be a paraphrase of a textbook in dialectical materialism. It is Marxism pure and undefiled. Such is the basis of the foreign aid program which the churchmen so fondly espouse, and such is the ideology to which they are betraying the great body of Christians who follow their leadership.

EGYPT OFFERS a case example of the validity of the Marxist foreign-aid theory. For over a hundred years Egypt has been the recipient of European capital and technical assistance in the development of the Nile Valley. Today there are in Egypt modern railway systems, hydroelectric works, water impoundage and distribution systems, textile mills, banks and exchanges — all the paraphernalia of modern economic civilization which the foreign-aid program is seeking to promote elsewhere in Asia. Has Egypt achieved a "politically mature, democratic society"? Would the present political condition of Egypt be different had all this economic assistance come from the United States rather than from Europe?

Has the foreign aid program succeeded in "conditioning" the peoples of other lands to a better regard for the United States and things American? We have two pieces of evidence on this. Wendell Willkie, returning from his world tour in 1941-42, reported on the "great reservoir of good will" for the American people which he found, the result of the efforts of missionaries carrying the gospel of love. Today, twelve years after the War and the appropriation of nearly $75 billion for foreign aid, the reservoir is steadily draining away. Here is what Hanson W. Baldwin, military analyst of *The New York Times,* writes, commenting upon a review of the logistics of war by Colonel Jasper J. Wilson of the United States Armor Board at Fort Knox:

"World War II was fought, he pointed out, against a coalition with a population of about 240,000,000. . . . The total population of our potential enemies in World War III might be 1,250,000,000 people."

Christian missionaries, carrying their message to the hearts of individuals, created a "reservoir of good will." But our junketeering aid distributors, accepting the premises of Marxism, have created a reservoir of hate.

---

* The Center for International Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: "The Objectives of United States Economic Assistance Programs." Senate Committee Print.

Elgin Groseclose, international economist and business consultant, has written extensively on the foreign aid program. During World War II he served as Treasurer General of Iran, and he is the author of *Introduction to Iran.*

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "FOREIGN AID IS NOT CHRISTIAN" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page Article: single copy 15¢ (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 10 HUMAN EVENTS March 10, 1958

Article Section II *Printed in Two Sections*

TV WESTERNS TELL A STORY

Our Diplomats Should Watch Them

By DAVID SHEA TEEPLE

IN THE otherwise gloomy skies of 1958 at least one cloud has a silver lining. The television westerns are telling a story that our diplomats and political leaders should watch.

Many conservatives viewed with alarm the spread of television, recognizing its tremendous capabilities for political indoctrination from Washington. The "fireside chats" of FDR, after all, were still a vivid memory; and we know who controls most of the radio and television industry in America. To put it mildly, they could seldom be characterized as "conservatives."

For some time it looked as though such fears were well founded. For years the American people have been fed a TV diet of psychological dramas portraying the innermost struggles of man with his environment; sociological messages; "arty" shows, often effeminate in character; plays which ended so abruptly that the present writer (for one) had to inquire of his wife if the show were really over; sex rampant; the eternal triangle, *etc.*

We know, however, that the Madison Avenue hucksters are motivated by only one goal, namely, profits. The sponsor has got to sell his goods or he will seek another agent. Eventually, the Madison Avenue boys have had to respond to the public demand in TV entertainment or lose out to their more sagacious competitors.

The TV owners and pressure groups did not cause the present situation — it was forced on them by popular demand.

If you want to know what the people demand, take any TV guide for your area and make a compilation. The people want westerns — "horse operas." In the Washington, D .C. area (presumably one of the most cynical and sophisticated regions in the country) between seven and ten p.m., there are 25 such programs scheduled every week. Just for the record let us list them:

Wells Fargo; Frontier Theatre; Annie Oakley; Have Gun, Will Travel; Tombstone Territory; Tales of the Texas Rangers; Jim Bowie; Judge Roy Bean; Footlight Theatre; Frontier Doctor; Wyatt Earp; The Californians; Wagon Train; Stories of the Century; Cheyenne; Colt '45; Trackdown; Gunsmoke; Zane Grey Theatre; Restless Gun; The Lone Ranger; Wild Bill Hickok; Sheriff of Cochise County; Sugarfoot; Maverick.

In the event that anyone believes these to be children's programs, he has only to question his adult neighbors as to their viewing habits. (This does not deny similar leanings among the kids. Christmas trees last year sheltered realistic imitations of almost every type of lethal weapon. It appears that the owner of a nationwide concession of Do-It-Yourself United Nations Peace Conference Kits would starve to death.)

THE FORMAT of most TV westerns is basically the same. In fact, it is the same sort of thing that many of us watched in the Saturday matinees in the days of Tom Mix and Hoot Gibson — before we were taken over by a group of fuzzy-minded internationalists.

Did anyone ever see a western hero who lacked courage, integrity, honesty, patriotism and devotion to his friends? Have you ever seen a "horse opera" that did not glorify the past of our Nation? Does the hero ever have any question in his mind about what is right and what is wrong? Does the show so much as ever imply that the hero will even consider any compromise with evil? As a viewer, do you

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever have any question as to which will triumph — good or evil? Don't the villains have all the bad personal habits and can't you identify one just by looking at him? Isn't there a constant dose of respect for God, women and the home?

Considering that millions of Americans watch these performances every night, can we draw any conclusions? In the first place this is propaganda — but self-administered propaganda. The public has told the hucksters that if they want to sell their cigarettes, cereals or automobiles via TV they have to present westerns. Furthermore, in the successful western the hero must be a rough-and-ready character, not a dressed-up dude rancher. If he draws his gun somebody is going to get hurt. Nobody pushes him around.

Unless this trend is merely a mechanism for total escape from reality, which the author doubts, wouldn't it be a good idea for our diplomats and political leaders to watch more of these shows? Maybe they could learn something. For example, would Wyatt Earp stop at some frontier equivalent of the 38th Parallel when the rustlers were escaping with the herd? Ridiculous! Would Marshal Dillon refuse to allow his deputies to use shotguns for their own defense because of the terrible nature of the weapon? Ha! Would the Lone Ranger under any circumstance allow himself to be bullied and threatened by those who sought to destroy the principles by which he lives? Would "Restless Gun" or Jim Hardy of "Wells Fargo" attempt to buy friends who would not support them otherwise? Can you imagine Paladin of "Have Gun, Will Travel" standing aside while women and children were being massacred? (Dare I mention Hungary?) Can you imagine Cheyenne living in a perpetual state of jitters because he feared the next move of some gunslinger? Can you feature Judge Roy Bean releasing a murderer on some technicality devised by a slick lawyer? Would Wild Bill Hickok sell guns and whiskey to the bad men? (Should we mention Tito?)

OUR diplomats seem to be going one way while the American people are going the other. While the striped-pants boys appear to be bent on "peace at any price," have the American people begun to indicate that what they want is a return to the fundamental virtues which made this Nation great — death before dishonor, justice, liberty, honesty and human dignity?

The American people seem to have realized (if their taste in television is any indication) that peace with the "bad men" can only be accomplished if the "bad men" desire to reform and assume a decent position in society. The reformation must be demonstrated by deeds, and not by words.

The American public, according to these and other signs, wants to abandon the fuzzy-minded philosophy that can see nothing but grey, and return to the days when things were either black or white, right or wrong.

Maybe it would be a good idea to make TV westerns compulsory viewing for US diplomats so they then will have a rough idea of how the vast majority of the American people are really thinking.

(This article is based on one appearing in the *American Mercury* for April, 1958.)

David Shea Teeple has held many responsible positions in the Executive and Legislative branches of Government. He is now a consultant to industry and to several Congressional committees and Executive departments. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "Are Subsidies Sinful Only for Socialists?" December 21, 1957.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "TV WESTERNS TELL A STORY" at $.....

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15¢ (coins, not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½¢ per copy; for airmail, add 1¢ per copy.

Prices of 4-page articles or news sections are as follows: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED